

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner indicated that claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 23 and 24 would be allowable over the prior art if the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections were overcome.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §112 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner alleges: "The claims have been amended to recite "no portion of the printed design is within the active portion of the wafer" and "said determining being based on where the design is printed within the peripheral portion of the wafer". These new recitations could not be found in the specification as originally filed."

In response, Applicants have amended the claims to delete the phrase "no portion of the printed design is within the active portion of the wafer".

In additional response, Applicants respectfully contend that the phrase "said determining being based on where the design is printed within the peripheral portion of the wafer" is supported in the specification, page 9, lines 1-12 which recites:

"The user of the apparatus 10 knows where the reticle blinds were positioned (or are supposed to have been positioned) and therefore also knows which portions of the patterns 81-83 should be printed into each of pattern fields 51-53. If correct portions of the patterns 81-83 are printed into each of corresponding portions of pattern fields 51-53, then the upper reticle blind 64 is correctly positioned. If incorrect portions of the patterns 81-83 are printed into any of the pattern fields 51-53, then the upper reticle blind 64 is not correctly positioned. Thus, the portions of the patterns 81-83 that are printed in each of the pattern fields 51-53 serve as a measuring device for determining whether the upper reticle blind 64 is correctly positioned. Similarly, a positioning of the lower reticle blind 65, so as to cover only a portion of the pattern fields 57-59, would facilitate a determination of whether the lower reticle blind 65 is correctly positioned within the exposure apparatus 10 of FIG. 1."

Based on the preceding argument, Applicants respectively contend that claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 23 and 24 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner alleges: "Independent claims 2 and 4 have been amended to recite "printing a design only within a peripheral portion..." and then steps are recited where exposure occurs and then determining if the reticle blind is correctly placed. This is indefinite because it is not clear. The first step recites printing the design and then the second step appears to recite a second step of exposure. It is not clear if these two steps are the same or not.".

In response, Applicants have amended claims 2 and 4 to clarify the invention.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0456.

Date: 08/30/2005

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850